

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/711,267	09/07/2004	Terry J. Gordon	GORDP005US	5266
27949 7	590 06/23/2006		EXAMINER	
LAW OFFICE OF JAY R. YABLON			MAHONEY, CHRISTOPHER E	
910 NORTHUMBERLAND DRIVE SCHENECTADY, NY 12309-2814			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SCHENECIA	.D1, N1 12509-2014		2851	
			DATE MAIL ED: 06/23/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		9			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/711,267	GORDON, TERRY J.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Christopher E. Mahoney	2851			
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	he correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING C - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply to will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS te, cause the application to become ABAND	ION. be timely filed from the mailing date of this communication. ONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 A	<u>April 2006</u> .				
,	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.				
• —	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11	, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-16</u> is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-16</u> is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	awn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) The drawing(s) filed on <u>07 September 2004</u> is Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	/are: a) \square accepted or b) \square obe drawing(s) be held in abeyance.	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. Its have been received in Appliority documents have been received in Rule 17.2(a)).	cation No eived in this National Stage			
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summ Paper No(s)/Ma 3) 5) Notice of Inform 6) Other:				

Application/Control Number: 10/711,267

Art Unit: 2851

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-3, 7-11 and 15-16 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 3-4 and 41-45 of U.S. Patent No. 6,363,223. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the patented claims anticipate the currently pending claims.

Claims 4-6 and 12-14 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 3-4 and 41-45 of U.S. Patent No. 6,363,223 in view of Pena (U.S. Pat. No. 5,020,262). U.S. Patent No. 6,363,223 teaches the salient features of the claimed invention except for the scope. Pena teaches that it was known to utilize a photographic firearm scope. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the features taught by Pena for the purpose of reducing

Application/Control Number: 10/711,267 Page 3

Art Unit: 2851

parallax between the photographed image and the user's view. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the scope integral to reduce the number of parts (prevents misplacement and loss of smaller parts). The applicant should note that it has been held that forming in one piece an article which has formerly been formed in two pieces and put together involves only routine skill in the art. *Howard v. Detroit Stove Works*, 150 U.S. 164 (1893).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher E. Mahoney whose telephone number is (571) 272-2122. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5PM, Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Judy Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-2258. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

CHRISTOPHER MAHONEY PRIMARY EXAMINER